



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/474,418	12/29/1999	RONALD G. KENNEDY	GEM-30834	2216

27061 7590 06/25/2003

ZIOLKOWSKI PATENT SOLUTIONS GROUP, LLC (GEMS)
14135 NORTH CEDARBURG ROAD
MEQUON, WI 53097

EXAMINER

VAUGHN JR, WILLIAM C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 06/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/474,418

Applicant(s)

KENNEDY, RONALD G.

Examiner

William C. Vaughn, Jr.

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

WCV

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to the Request for Reconsideration received 20 May 2003.
2. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.
3. The application has been examined. **Claims 1-24** are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Canfield, II, et al., (Canfield), U.S. Patent No. 5,897,498.
6. Regarding **claim 1**, Canfield discloses *a remote servicing communication system for in-field product comprising: at least one on-line center having access to service software at a centralized facility so as to service in-field product remotely [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 5-57]; an in-field product at a customer site that is not readily capable of direct communication with the on-line center; at least one portable service interface operable with the in-field product at the customer site and having software for communication with the on-line center [see Canfield, Col. 2, lines 52-63]; a first communications link connecting the portable service interface to the on-line center [see Canfield, Col. 4, lines 58-67, Col. 5, lines 1-46]; and a second*

Art Unit: 2142

communications link connecting the portable service interface with the in-field product to complete a connection between the in-field product and the on-line center through the portable service interface [see Canfield, Col. 3, lines 19-67, Col. 4, lines 1-67 and Col. 6, lines 7-67]. By this rationale **claim 1** is rejected.

7. Regarding **claim 2**, Canfield further discloses *wherein the connection between the in-field product and the on-line center is utilized to conduct a diagnostic evaluation of the infield product* [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 5-14]. By this rationale **claim 2** is rejected.

8. Regarding **claim 3**, Canfield further discloses *wherein the in-field product is a medical image scanner and the on-line center contains service software designed for utilization with a wide variety of medical image scanners, and wherein after the portable service interface sends a data message identifying the medical image scanner, the on-line center selects service software based on the medical image scanner identification and automatically downloads the selected service: software to the medical image scanner or executes the selected service software from the portable service interface* [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 5-37]. By this rationale **claim 3** is rejected.

9. Regarding **claim 4**, Canfield further discloses *wherein the connection between the in-field product and the on-line center is utilized to access data from the on-line center* [see Canfield, Col. 6, lines 26-67]. By this rationale **claim 4** is rejected.

10. Regarding **claim 5**, Canfield further discloses *wherein the accessed data from the on-line center includes at least one of a configuration file, a golden file, a protocol and a software program* [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 15-27]. By this rationale **claim 5** is rejected.

11. Regarding **claim 6**, Canfield further discloses *wherein the portable service interface sends a data message signal to the on-line center identifying the in-field product such that the*

Art Unit: 2142

on-line center selects service software specifically designed for the in-field product [see

Canfield, Col. 8, lines 27-34]. By this rationale **claim 6** is rejected.

12. Regarding **claim 7**, Canfield further discloses *wherein the second communication link connecting the portable service interface to the in-field product is one of a serial cable and a local area network cable* [see Canfield, Figure 1, item 31]. By this rationale **claim 7** is rejected.

13. Regarding **claim 8**, Canfield further discloses *the system wherein the portable service interface is a laptop computer having loaded therein remote resource communication software to automatically communicate with the on-line center and transfer data therebetween* [see Canfield, Col. 3, 20-67]. By this rationale **claim 8** is rejected.

14. Regarding **claim 9**, Canfield further discloses *wherein the connection to the on-line center provides access to a remote on-line support engineer to provide real time assistance with the in-field product through the portable service interface* [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 5-35]. By this rationale **claim 9** is rejected.

15. Regarding **claim 10**, Canfield further discloses *a method of providing remote service communication between an on-line center and an in-field product at a customer site where the in-field product is not readily capable of direct communication with the on-line center comprising: loading on-line center connectivity software on a portable service interface* [see rejection of claim 1, supra]; *connecting the portable service interface to the in-field product* [see rejection of claim 1, supra]; *electronically connecting the on-line center with the portable service interface* [see rejection of claim 1, supra]; *accessing data from the in-field with the portable service interface* [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 15-27]; *and interfacing between the on-line center*

Art Unit: 2142

and the in-field product with the portable service interface [see rejection of claim 1, supra]. By this rationale **claim 10** is rejected.

16. Regarding **claim 11**, Canfield discloses *further comprising the steps of transmitting data identifying the in-field product to the on-line center for evaluating and servicing the in-field product* [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 26-57], *and automatically selecting service software at the on-line center* [see Canfield, Col. 7, lines 25-49], *and generating in-field product evaluation information and displaying the in-field product evaluation information on the portable service interface* [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 15-57]. By this rationale **claim 11** is rejected.

17. Regarding **claim 12**, Canfield further discloses *wherein the interfacing step includes accessing data from the on-line center including at least one of a configuration file, a golden file, a protocol and a software program* [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 15-27]. By this rationale **claim 12** is rejected.

18. Regarding **claim 13**, Canfield further discloses *wherein the in-field product is a medical image scanner* [see Canfield, Figure 3, Col. 7, lines 25-49] *and further comprising automatically selecting at the on-line center service software based on a specific identification of the medical image scanner* [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 25-62]. By this rationale **claim 13** is rejected.

19. Regarding **claim 14**, Canfield discloses *further comprising the step of automatically checking whether a field service engineer requests an analysis/evaluation, and if so, transmitting system data to the in-field product and performing an analysis/evaluation of the in-field product* [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 15-27]. By this rationale **claim 14** is rejected.

Art Unit: 2142

20. Regarding **claim 15**, Canfield discloses *further comprising displaying results of the analysis/evaluation so that the field service engineer can monitor the analysis/evaluation* [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 15-27]. By this rationale **claim 15** is rejected.

21. Regarding **claim 16**, Canfield further discloses *wherein the connecting step further includes connecting the portable service interface to the in-field product by one of a serial cable and a local area network cable* (Canfield teaches the system having a serial port for converting digital signals from the serial port into analog signals suitable for transmission over telephone lines), [see Canfield, Col. 3, lines 30-65]. By this rationale **claim 16** is rejected.

22. Regarding **claim 17**, Canfield discloses *further comprising the steps of automatically checking to see whether a field service engineer requests access to remote resource information, and if so, downloading the remote resource information to the in-field product* [see Canfield, Col. 7, lines 25-47]. By this rationale **claim 17** is rejected.

23. Regarding **claim 18**, Canfield further discloses *further comprising the step of displaying remote resource information to the in-field service engineer* [see Canfield, Col. 7, lines 62-67 and Col. 8, lines 1-57]. By this rationale **claim 18** is rejected.

24. Regarding **claim 19**, Canfield further discloses *wherein the electronically accessing step occurs through a global computer network system* [see Canfield, Col. 1, lines 14-29, Col. 3, lines 19-67 and Col. 4, lines 1-8]. By this rationale **claim 19** is rejected.

25. Regarding **claim 20**, Canfield further discloses *wherein the electronically connecting step further includes providing access to a remote on-line support engineer to provide real time assistance with the in-field product through the portable service interface* [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 27-34]. By this rationale **claim 20** is rejected.

Art Unit: 2142

26. Regarding **claim 21**, Canfield further discloses *a method of servicing an in-field product not readily capable of direct communication with a remote on-line center comprising: providing a portable service interface having software for communication with an on-line center connecting the portable interface [see Canfield, Col. 2, lines 52-63]; electronically connecting the on-line center with the portable service interface [see Canfield, Col. 4, lines 57-67 and Col. 5, lines 1-45] from the portable service interface, selecting at least one servicing function available from the on-line center resulting in at least one of the following: interfacing the in-field product with the on-line center through the portable service interface to conduct a diagnostic evaluation of the in-field product [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 15-35]; downloading information to the in-field product from the on-line center through the portable service interface [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 15-57]; and displaying one of the diagnostic evaluation and the downloaded information on the portable service interface as a result of the selecting step [see rejection of claims 1 and 10, supra]. By this rationale **claim 21** is rejected.*

27. Regarding **claim 22**, Canfield further discloses wherein in-field product is a medical image scanner [see Canfield, Col. 7, lines 25-49] *and further comprising the steps of transmitting a data message identifying the medical image scanner from the portable service interface to the on-line center [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 35-49], automatically selecting service software at the on-line center based on the medical image scanner identification, and automatically downloading the selected service software to the medical image scanner [see Canfield, Col. 5-57]. By this rationale **claim 22** is rejected.*

28. Regarding **claim 23**, Canfield discloses *further comprising the steps of automatically checking whether a field service engineer requests an analysis/evaluation, and if so, transmitting*

Art Unit: 2142

system data to the in-field product and performing an analysis/evaluation of the in-field product, and displaying results of the analysis/evaluation so that the field service engineer can monitor the analysis/evaluation [see Canfield, Col. 8, lines 15-27]. By this rationale **claim 23** is rejected.

29. Regarding **claim 24**, Canfield discloses further *comprising the steps of automatically checking to see whether a field service engineer requests access to remote resource information, and if so, downloading the remote resource information to the in-field product, and displaying a remote resource information to the in-field service engineer* [see rejection of claims 10, 14, 15 and 21, supra]. By this rationale **claim 24** is rejected.

Double Patenting

30. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 2142

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

31. **Claims 1-24** are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claim 1-44 of Application No. 09/199,506. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

32. The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the context of the claimed invention is the same as the context of the cited claims of the U.S. Patent Application 09/199,506.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other application.

Response to Arguments

33. It is the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in manner, which distinguishes over the prior art. As it is Applicant's right to continue to claim as broadly as possible their invention. It is also the Examiner's right to continue to interpret the claim language as broadly as possible. It is the Examiner's position that the detailed functionality that allows for Applicant's invention to overcome the prior art used in the rejection,

Art Unit: 2142

fails to differentiate in detail how these features are unique. As it is extremely well known in the networking art as already shown by Canfield as well as other cited prior art of record disclosed (see also Jago), to remotely service and in-field product as well as automatically analyze and evaluate that in-field product as well as other claimed features of Applicant's invention. Thus, it is clear that Applicant must submit amendments to the claims in order to distinguish over the prior art use in the rejection that discloses different features of Applicant's claim invention.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

34. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Friz et al. (Friz), U.S. Patent No. 5,786,994, discloses a system for monitoring laser medical imagers. The system contains software that is configured to periodically poll a remotely located laser imager over a period of time to generate image quality control reports [see Friz, Col. 3, lines 23-67, Col. 4, lines 1-67 and Col. 5, lines 1-56].

Conclusion

35. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William C. Vaughn, Jr. whose telephone number is (703) 306-9129. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00, 1st Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Powell can be reached on (703) 305-9703. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2142

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9700.

WCV

WCV

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2142

June 20, 2003


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER